



International Musicological Society
Internationale Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft
Sociedad Internacional de Musicología
Società Internazionale di Musicologia
Société Internationale de Musicologie

The Translation of Byzantine Chants into the "New Method": Joasaph Pantokratorinos – Composer and Scribe of Musical Manuscripts

Author(s): Bjarne Schartau and Christian Troelsgård

Source: *Acta Musicologica*, Vol. 69, Fasc. 2 (Jul. – Dec., 1997), pp. 134–142

Published by: [International Musicological Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/932652>

Accessed: 09/11/2010 23:45

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=inmuso>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Musicological Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Acta Musicologica*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Translation of Byzantine Chants into the „New Method“: Joasaph Pantokratorinos - Composer and Scribe of Musical Manuscripts¹

BJARNE SCHARTAU (OSLO) AND CHRISTIAN TROELSGÅRD (COPENHAGEN)

In the years 1814-15 a Patriarchal school of music was established in Constantinople with commission to reform the old Byzantine neumatic notation and increase the educational level of Greek Orthodox church singers². Under the guidance of the „Three Teachers“, a great number of *psaltai* were trained according to the notation and theory of the „*Nea Methodos*“, which reduced the stock of both interval signs (*fōnetika*) and phrasing or group signs (*hypostaseis*) in relation to the old notation. At the same time some of the rhythmical, intonational, and ornamental, or ‚exegetic‘, practices of the period were explicated. Joasaph, a monk from the Pantokrator monastery on Mount Athos, was probably among the students of this school, which functioned until about 1821.

Based on the ascriptions of certain settings in the MS Copenhagen IGLM 3,8⁰ to Joasaph Pantokratorinos, the MS in its entirety could be identified as his product³. Furthermore, a section of our MS 6,8⁰ from the same collection appears to be written by Joasaph, although he now styles himself „Joseph“ Pantokratorinos⁴. Irrespective of the slight change of name, we are without doubt confronted with the same scribe. But a more radical change has taken place: while the music in MS 3,8⁰ is still written in the latest stage of Middle Byzantine or Round Notation, the section of MS 6,8⁰ written by Joasaph/Ioseph Pantokratorinos is in the notation of the *Nea Methodos*⁵.

Fortunately a number of the same pieces, including some by Joasaph/Ioseph himself (a complete set of *Cherubika* according to the modes), can be found in both MSS, thus offering an opportunity - not so frequent as might be imagined - of comparing one person’s treatment of the same material in both the old and the

¹ The present article is a revised version of a paper read in memory of Jørgen Raasted (1927-95) at the 19th International Congress of Byzantine Studies, held in Copenhagen, August 1996. Raasted had originally planned a contribution for the congress on the same subject, inspired by Schartau’s findings in the small collection of late Byzantine musical manuscripts, acquired by Jørgen Raasted and now belonging to the Institute for Greek and Latin, University of Copenhagen. For full description and inventories, see B. SCHARTAU, *Manuscripts of Byzantine Music in Denmark*, in: *Cahiers de l’institut du moyen-âge grec et latin* 48 (Copenhagen 1984), pp. 15-104. We thank Ioannis Arvanitis for helpful comments.

² See MAUREEN M. MORGAN, *The „Three Teachers“ and their place in the History of the Greek Church Music*, in: *Studies in Eastern Chant*, II (1971), pp. 86-99.

³ SCHARTAU, *Manuscripts of Byzantine Music*, pp. 86-89: (103v) Iōasaf monachou syntomon. echos d’ (Hagios ho Theos), (112r) tou autou <Petrou Lampadariou> syntomēthen par’ emou Iōasaf. pl. b’ (Hagios ho Theos), (116r) Iōasaf monachou, b’ (Hagios ho Theos); (135r-145v) Hetera cheroubika syntethenta par’ emou Iōasaf monachou Pantokratorinou, échos a’ (Hoi ta Cheroubim) etc.; (158r) Heteron syntethen par’ emou Iōasaf monachou, échos barys (Aineite ton Kyriion); (178v) ta auta syntomôtera, Iōasaf, échos b’ (Hagios Kyrios Sabbatōth); (199v) tou Iōasaf: <kratēma> échos d’ (Terirem).

⁴ (fol. 82r) Cheroubika syntethenta par’ emou Iōsēf monachou Pantokratorinou, échos a’ Pa (Hoi ta Cheroubim).

⁵ Joasaph’s two Copenhagen MSS are mentioned by G. TH. STATHIS, *Hagioreitikē Melourgia*, in: *To Hagion Oros, Chthes - Sēmera - Aurio, Hetaireia Makedonikōn Spoudōn* (Thessaloniki 1996), p. 306, note 50.

new notation. We shall return to Joasaph's musical evidence on this important - and controversial - phase in the transmission of the Byzantine chant below.

A perusal of the indices to G. Th. Stathis' (as yet published) three monumental catalogue volumes on the musical MSS in the monasteries of Mount Athos⁶ has yielded no references to a Joasaph/Ioseph expressly styled „Pantokratorinos”, but the *repertorium* of Greek scribes of the 17th and 18th centuries by Linos Politis - Maria Politi⁷ lists two musical MSS, both of them subscribed by *Iōasaf Pantokratorinos Hagioreitēs*, in Samos in the course of the year 1812⁸. The existence of further MSS written by Joasaph/Ioseph Pantokratorinos in Greek or foreign, public or private, collections, not yet properly catalogued, can of course not be precluded.

The bulky MS Patmos 816⁹, is written in the latest stage of the Middle Byzantine Notation and has no settings by Joasaph himself; the composers most widely represented are the celebrated names associated with the Great Church from the 18th century to the date of writing¹⁰: Ioannes Protopsaltes, Petros Peloponnesios the Lampadarios, Iakobos Protopsaltes¹¹, Daniel [of Tyrnovo] Protopsaltes, and Petros Byzantios Protopsaltes, but also settings of other contemporary (or quasi-contemporary) composers, such as Parthenios Meteorites, Stephanos Xeropotaminos, Meletios Sinaites Kres „*ho neos*”, Georgios Kres (died 1815) and several others can be found. As in most other Anthologia-MSS from this period the chronologically older Petros Bereketes is well represented. The „old” masters of the 14th-15th centuries are only represented through *exégēseis* by later composers: Ioannes Koukouzeles once, Ioannes Kladas once, Manouel Gazes once, and Manouel Chrysaphes twice.

Also the MS IGLM 3,8⁰ is written in the latest stage of the old Byzantine Notation. Apart from Joasaph's own settings (see note 3), the composers are chiefly those of the Great Church mentioned above. Other composers of the 15th-18th centuries are represented with only one setting each: Manouel „*ho megas rhētor*” = Chrysaphes, Chrysaphes the Younger („*ho neos*”), Germanos of New Patras, Balasios the Priest, Manouel Goutas, Staurinos Lazos and Meletios Sinaites Kres „*ho neos*”.

The only manuscript written by Joasaph according to the New Method Notation is IGLM 6,8⁰. The part of the MS written by him, fols. 26r-153v, exhibits apart from Joasaph/Joseph's own Cheroubika (82r-116r) settings by Ioannes Protopsaltes, Petros Peloponnesios the Lampadarios, Iakobos Protopsaltes, Daniel Protopsaltes, one piece by the „old” (15th century) Manouel Chrysaphes,

⁶ GR. TH. STATHIS, *Ta Cheirografoi Byzantinēs mousikēs. Hagion Oros*, I-III (Athens 1975, 1979, and 1993).

⁷ L. POLITIS - M. POLITI, *Bibliografoi 17ou-18ou aiōna, Synoptikē katagrafē. Deltio tou historikou kai palaiografikou archeiou*, VI 1988-1992 (Athens 1992), pp. 313-345. For earlier cataloguing of these MSS, see M. RICHARD, *Répertoire de Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits grecs* (Paris 1958), p. 189.

⁸ Of these two only Patmos 816 has been accessible (in microfilm) for the present research.

⁹ POLITIS - POLITI, *Bibliografoi*, p. 491.

¹⁰ Cf. CHRISTOS PATRINELIS, *Protopsaltæ, Lampadarii, and Domestikoi of the Great Church during the post-Byzantine Period (1453-1821)*, in: *Studies in Eastern Chant*, III (1973), pp. 141-170.

¹¹ It should be noted that Iakobos Protopsaltes Peloponnesios in Patmos 816 (40r) and (189r) is designated „*didaskalos*” (teacher), which might indicate that our Joasaph/Ioseph was a sometime pupil of Iakobos. However, such a designation would regularly have been „our teacher” or „my teacher”.

and one by Zacharias „hierodiakonos“, who can not be identified with certainty, but presumably he was an Athonite of the 18th century).

*

Ex. 1: MS 3,8⁰fol. 141v (above), MS 6,8⁰fol. 103v (below)

1 Hoi

2 ta

3 che- (nou-) rou-

4 (che- rou-) bim

Ex. 1:

(continued, after the *teretisma*)

5. tōn ho- lōn hy- po- de- xo- me- noj

6. tais an- ge- li- (an- ge- li-) kais

7. a- o- ra- tōs

8. do- ry- fo- rou- me- non ta- xe- sin

9. a- llē- lou- i- a.

(continues)

The earliest printed songbook in the *New Method* notation is the *Syntomon Doxastarion* of Petros Peloponnesios, published in 1820 in Bucarest, Roumania, and it carries the following subtitle: „Translated (*metafrasthen*) according to the New Method of the most learned (*mousikologiōtātōn*) teachers of the New System“. ,Translation‘ (*metafrasis*) is often the word used to describe the transcription of Late Byzantine chants from the old into the new notation, which although it involves some of the same topics, should be distinguished from the concept of ,interpretation‘ (*exēgēsis*), which in its own turn refers to a variety of different procedures of embellished performance or re-composition in the later Byzantine repertoires¹². The presence of the same pieces in our two MSS, written by the same person within a relatively limited span of years, diminishes the uncertainty as to a difference in the musical tradition and of the MSS actually used for transcriptions into the New Method. This uncertainty has sometimes been mentioned as an obstacle to safe conclusions¹³.

To start from a composition by Joasaph himself, example 1 shows the beginning and the ending of his Cheroubikon in the second plagal mode. The ,old‘ notation (upper staff) is rendered without rhythm, except for the indication of considerably prolonged notes, while the new one (lower staff) is transcribed rhythmically and transposed one step upwards to the ,medieval‘ position of the second plagal mode on E, in order to simplify the comparison. It is evident that Joasaph uses slightly more signs in the new notation in lines 1, 2, and 8, considerably more signs in lines 4, 6, and 9, while lines 5, 3, and 7 have exactly the same number of notes in the supposed original and in the ,translation‘. This suggests that Joasaph wanted to explicit some common ornamentation practices of his era, namely that of extending the cadences (lines 4, 6 and 9) with more or less standardized material, a procedure which also included repetitions of words in the chant text. Possibly he also introduced slight alterations or elaborations, as for example seen at the middle of the opening line. Clearly, Joasaph did not always need more interval signs to translate a piece written in his youth into the New Notation. Following, the element of *exēgēsis* involved in his ,translation‘ is not linked mechanically to the group signs of the old notation, but consists here

¹² The earliest traces of *exēgēsis* are seen in MS Athens 917, 16th c., probably referring to an experience of a beginning tension between the contemporary ornamentation practice and the written tradition. The theoretical treatment of *exēgēsis* began around 1800 with the treatise by Apostolos Konstas from Chios. CHRYSANTHOS OF MADYTAS, *Theōrētikon Mega* (Trieste 1832),§ 75, mentions *en passant* ‘exegetic’ compositions, and from the late 19th century the theme was taken up by musicology, see e.g. G. I. BIOLAKIS, *Meletē sygkritisē tēs nyn en chrēsei mousikēs grafēs pros tēn tou Petrou Peloponniēsou kai pros tēn archaioteran grafēn*, in: *Parartēma Ekklesiastikēs Alētheias* 1 (Constantinople 1900), pp. 32-53, and later important contributions are K. PSACHOS, *Hē paras ēmantikē tēs Byzantinēs sēmeiografias* (Athens 1917); H. W. J. TILLYARD, *The Stenographic Theory of Byzantine Music*, in: *Laudate*, II (1924), pp. 216-25, and III (1925) pp. 28-32; S. KARAS, *Hē byzantinē mousikē sēmeiografia* (Athens 1933); G. Th. STATHIS, *An Analysis of the Sticheron „Ton hēliōn krypsanta“ by Germanos, Bishop of New Patras, [The old „Synoptic“ and the New „Analytical“ Method of Byzantine Notation]*, in: *Studies in Eastern Chant*, IV (1971), pp. 177-227; id., *Hē exēgēsis tēs palaias Byzantinēs Mousikēs sēmeiografias* (Athens 1978); H. HUSMANN, *Interpretation und Ornamentierung in der nachbyzantinschen Musik*, in: *Acta Musicologica*, 52 (1980), pp. 101-21; G. Th. STATHIS, *The „Abridgements“ of Byzantine and Postbyzantine Compositions*, in: *Cahiers de l'institut du moyen-âge grec et latin*, 44 (1983), pp. 16-38; E. TONCEVA, *Zur südslawischen Psalmódischen Tradition („Bulgarischer“ Polyeleos - Psalm 135)*, in: PONIATOWSKA I. AND CEZARY NELKOWSKI (edd.), *X Musica Antiqua Europaea Orientalis*, Vol. 1, *Acta Musicologica*, Bydgoszcz 1994 (Bydgoszcz 1997), pp. 139-50.

¹³ Recently in G. AMARGIANAKIS, *The Interpretation of the Old Sticherarion*, in: *Byzantine Chant - Tradition and Reform, Acts of a Meeting held at the Danish Institute at Athens 1993*, ed. C. TROELSGÅRD (Athens 1997), pp. 23-51.

in a practice of adding elaborated standard formulas at the cadences. It is a matter of style.

Example 2 shows Joasaph's translation of some lines from a *Polyeleos* setting (Ps. 135) in first plagal mode by Petros Peloponnesios (+ 1777). In this more syllabic style, Joasaph sticks very faithfully to the old notation, and no greater melodic extensions are seen in the new notation. The difference limits itself to the addition of, preferably fast, notes to fill in third or fourth leaps, or to the embellishment of some notes, mostly prolonged values, with gracenotes or mordents. These slight adjustments seem to be an attempt to spell out some details of the current chant practice. The frequently used *lygismata* are normally rendered without ornamentation, but occasionally they produce a mordent in the new notation (eg. line 5), a feature also seen in example 1 (eg. line 2). The ten-

Ex. 2: MS 3,8° fol. 61 sqq., MS 6,8° fol. 26r sqq.

1 Dou-loi dou-loi Ky-ri-on

2 A-llē lou-i-a

3 Ai-nei-te to o-no-ma Ky-ri-ou

4 Ai-nei-te dou-loi Ky-ri-on

5 en au-lais oi-kou The-ou hē-mōn etc.

dency of elaborating the cadences is seen also in the syllabic Polyeleos, in the *Allélouia* refrains (line 2 and the subsequent *Allélouiaria*'), but is here restricted to modest melodic ornamentation.

Although differing from the medieval tradition, the neumation of the *kylisma* formulas from the same Polyeleos (see ex. 3) is regular in Post Byzantine MSS, and, following, the formula is listed in the „Method of great signs (*hypostaseis*)“ by Theodoulos from the middle of the 18th century¹⁴. In *kylisma a* (MS 3,8^o fol. 63r, 6,8^o fol. 29r) a turning note is inserted in the New Method translation, while this is not so in *kylisma b* (MS 3,8^o fol. 67v, 6,8^o fol. 36v). The filling in of fast notes in a descending fourth is a recurrent phenomenon in Joasaph’s translations, and it also happens without any group sign, black or red, placed in the neighbourhood. In *kylisma c*, however, from a Koinonikon in first mode by Daniel Protopsaltes (MS 3,8^o fol. 151r, 6,8^o fol. 146v), the melismatic style required for that genre makes Joasaph translate with a long *exégēsis*, which corresponds almost exactly to a *Kylisma* indicated by a method of *exégēseis* in MS Xeropotamou 357 from around 1820¹⁵.

Ex. 3:

Kylisma a)

Kylisma b)

Musical score for 'Pan-tai-chai' featuring two staves. The first staff shows the lyrics 'Pan-ta' and the second staff shows 'tai-chai'. The music includes various note values and rests, with a measure ending in '3' indicated by a circled '3' below the staff.

Kylisma c).

Handwritten musical score for 'Kylisma c)' in G clef, 2/4 time. The score consists of two staves of music. The first staff begins with a G clef, a '2/4' time signature, and a 'C' dynamic. The lyrics 'ei' are written below the staff, with a grace note above the first 'e'. The second staff begins with a G clef, a 'C' dynamic, and the lyrics '(ai-nei-)' in parentheses. The music features various performance markings, including slurs, grace notes, and dynamic marks like 'f' and 'p'.

The *tromikon* is a rather frequent sign in Joasaph's old neumations, and this sign is invariably rendered in the new notation with exactly the same number of interval signs. Also the melody associated with the *argosyntheton* in example 4 and the *xeron klasma* groups (see ex. 2, end of line 4) translate without additions. Although the sign used is clearly *xeron klasma*, both the formula and the position remind strongly of the medieval *homalon*; these two signs, sometimes also

¹⁴ Facsimile in STATHIS, *Hē palaiā Byzantinē sēmeiografia kai to problēma metagrāfēs tēs eis to pentagrammon*, in: *Byzantina* 7 (1975), Figs. 6-7.

¹⁵ Published by STATHIS, *Hē exēgēsis*, p. 15, formula 18d.

tromikon, often appear under the same sequence of interval signs in Late and Post Byzantine MSS. The *kratēma* is sometimes translated with a considerable lengthening (see ex. 1, line 1), whereas the possibility of adding a moderate ornament is also seen (ex. 1, line 2 and 9). Phrasing signs like *psēfiston*, *antikenōma* and *bareia* are taken over in the new notation without any apparent difference in their usage.

Ex. 4: Argosyntheton (MS 3,8⁰fol. 68v, 6,8⁰fol. 38r)



Living and working both before and after the years of the notational reform, Joasaph could be expected to suffer from a few „archaisms“ in his way of adapting the New Method notation. We have found very little of this kind; one example could be the combination of *apostrofos* and *petasthē* (see ex. 2, line 5), a combination approved by ‚The Three Teachers‘, but nevertheless avoided in most cases and substituted by *apostrofos* with *klasma*¹⁶. Also the placement of a *fthora* at the end of ex. 1, line 6 might be a trace of an ‚old‘ practice.

The existence of both pre- and postreform manuscripts written by one and the same scribe and composer might contribute to a better understanding of both the rhythmical features and the performance practice associated with the latest stage of the old Byzantine Notation. In his own pieces, it seems, Joasaph did not distinguish sharply between his role as scribe, as composer, and probably also as singer, *psaltēs*, as he here and there adds bits of new material. Even in the pieces written by other composers, he seems to enjoy a certain freedom in the detail, although we must generally assume that he wanted to represent one and the same musical reality in the two notations, according to the chant practices of his own period. In the syllabic pieces, he could embellish the melody with grace-notes and fill out leaps, or leave the notation very close to the old one. In the melismatic pieces, however, a performance practice with ornamented passages, a long *exēgēsis*, was usually applied. In both theoretical treatises¹⁷ and didactic chants of the period¹⁸ different examples of such traditional *exēgēseis* were systematised according to the red group signs of the old notation.

¹⁶ Cf. the same *Polyeleos* as rendered in *Mousikos Pandektēs* (ΖΩĒ), Vol. II, Athens 1975, pp. 50-66.

¹⁷ As for example MS Xeropotamou 357 and Docheiariou 389, STATHIS, *Hē exēgēsis*, pp. 44-81.

¹⁸ An *exēgēsis* of the *Mega Ison* by Koukouzeles were made by Petros Peloponnesios in the old notation at end of the 18th c., see ELENA TONCEVA, *Prepisi na chironomiceskogo pevchesko upraznenie na Joan Kukuzel*, in: *Academie Bulgare des Sciences, Bulletin de l'Institut de Musicologie*, XVIII (Sofia 1974), pp. 209-302, and translations into the New Method were made by one of the „Three Teachers“, Chourmouzios Chartophylax, and by Matthaios Ephesios

Although short and long forms certainly coexisted further back in the history of Byzantine chant, as seen in many chant traditions where oral procedures have an important role to play, the actual ornamentation practice of Joasaph and his contemporaries should be seen in connection with stylistic ideals promoted by the great masters from the second half of the 17th-18th centuries. Already at the beginning of this period, parts of the syllabic medieval repertoires had been subject to fundamental developments¹⁹, and the old melismatic repertoires *Asmatikon* and *Psaltikon* had either disappeared or been transformed through their partial incorporation in the Late and Post Byzantine Anthology MSS²⁰. On the other hand, a principally syllabic genre as the *kathismata* and *apolytikia automela*, though with minor tonal and melodic adjustments, presents a clear example of a direct continuation of the late medieval melodic tradition, even beyond the introduction of the New Method²¹.

Vatopedinos, see MARIA ALEXANDRU, Koukouzeles' *Mega Ison*, Ansätze einer kritischen Edition, in: *Cahiers de l'institut du moyen-âge grec et latin*, 66 (1996), pp. 3-23.

¹⁹ See E. MAKRIS, *Umarbeitungsvorgänge in der musikalischen Tradition des Anastasimatarions im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*, in: *X Musica Antiqua Europae Orientalis*, Vol. 1, *Acta Musicologica - Bydgoszcz* 1994, edd. PONIATOWSKA I. and CEZARY NELKOWSKI (Bydgoszcz 1997), pp. 217-226.

²⁰ Thus these two styles had at the time of CHRYSANTHOS (see *Theōrōtikon Mega*, § 404) amalgamated with the style of the elaborated, so-called kalophonic psalm settings, together with which they constitute the „*Papudikon melos*“ of the Post Byzantine anthologies.

²¹ See C. TROELSGÅRD, *The Repertory of Model Melodies (Automela) in Byzantine Musical Manuscripts*, Acts of a meeting held at Royaumont in December 1996, edd. C. HANNICK and M. PÉRES, Example 1 (forthcoming).